

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,930	04/13/2005	Ralph Nonninger	26553U	7436
20529 75	11/14/2006		EXAMINER	
NATH & ASSOCIATES 112 South West Street			SANDERS, KRIELLION ANTIONETTE	
Alexandria, VA			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
ŕ			1714	.
			DATE MAILED: 11/14/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	10/516,930	NONNINGER ET	AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kriellion A. Sanders	1714				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ac	Idress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time iill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this c D. (35 U.S.C. & 133)				
Status	•					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 Au</u>	iaust 2006	•				
. —	action is non-final.					
	,					
closed in accordance with the practice under E						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1, 5-15, 18- 20 and 27- 33</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>15,18,19 and 32</u> is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) <u>1,5-14,20,27-31 and 33</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			•			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	ſ.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form P	ГО-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior			Stage			
application from the International Bureau			·			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P10-948) 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	. 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/516,930

Art Unit: 1714

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 3. Claim 5 recites the limitation "titanium dioxide" in lines 2 and 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim since it depends from claim 1, which recites titanium oxide.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 5-14, and 20, 27-31 and 33 are rejected as being unpatentable under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mulvaney et al, US Patent No. 6,548,168 in view of Oldenburg et al, US Patent No. 6,344,272.

Mulvaney et al. discloses stabilized nanoparticles having a size of less than about 0.1 microns or 100 nm, that are stabilized by an insulating, semiconducting and/or metallic

Art Unit: 1714

coating and methods for their production. The particle may comprise a metal, such as copper, silver, gold, platinum, or a metal compound or alloy such as a metallic sulphide, a metallic arsenide, a metallic selenide, a metallic telluride, a metallic oxide, a metallic halide or a mixture thereof. Preferred particles are semiconductor nanoparticles. Examples of semiconductor nanoparticles include cadmium sulphide (CdS), germanium (Ge), silicon (Si), silicon carbide (SiC), selenium (Se), cadmium selenide (CdSe), cadmium telluride (CdTe), zinc sulphide (ZnS), zinc selenide (ZnSe)and zinc oxide (ZnO. The particle is coated with a coating layer. Preferably the coating thickness is between 10 and 30 nm. The coating is bonded to the particle through a bifunctional ligand of the formula:

$$A - X - B$$

wherein A is a first functional group that attaches to the particle, or to a coating formed on the particle, B is a second functional group that activates the surface of the core particle for nucleation of a coating layer and X is an optional linking group. The coating is selected from the group consisting of silica, Se, an organic conducting polymer, a metal, a metal oxide, a metal sulphide, a metal selenide, a metal telluride, and a metal halide. The metal oxide may be selected from the group consisting of titania, zirconia, alumina, zinc oxide, tin dioxide, or manganese oxide. The source of coating may be a metal sulfide selected from the group consisting of CdS and ZnS. The source of the coating may be a metal selenide selected from the group consisting of CdSe and ZnSe. The source of the coating may be a metal telluride selected from the group consisting of CdTe and ZnTe. The source of the coating may be a metal halide selected from the group consisting of Silver iodide (AgI) and silver bromide (AgBr).

Art Unit: 1714

The source of the coating may be a metal selected from the group consisting of platinum, palladium, iridium, bismuth, copper, silver, gold, and alloys and mixtures thereof. See col. 1, line 22 through col. through col. 5, line 52.

The stabilized particles of Mulvaney et al may be used to produce pigments, paints, fabrics and optics. See col. 8, lines 31-33.

In view of the fact that Mulvaney et al discloses the stabilized pigments to be useful in formulating paints, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to formulate a coating composition utilizing the claimed particles. This is particularly true since paints are a type of coating material. Likewise, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to select the most advantageous weight percentages of components from those disclosed within the Mulvaney et al invention to achieve the greatest antimicrobial results as desired. Mulvaney et al discloses that the core material comprises 0.1 to 15 % by weight of the core material. Since the components of the nanoparticles of Mulvaney al are the same as applicant's it is thought that the core-shell nature of patented and present particles are also the same.

Oldenburg et al discloses core-shell particles or particle mixtures of that may be added to polymers during their preparation by methods well known in the art. Suitable polymers include polyethylene, polyvinyl alcohol (PVA), latex, nylon, teflon, acrylic, Kevlar and epoxy. Claim 11 of the patent specifies the use of acrylics and epoxies. The compositions of the invention are particles that have at least two layers. At least one layer is immediately adjacent to and surrounds another layer. The innermost layer is the core. A

Application/Control Number: 10/516,930

Art Unit: 1714

Page 5

layer that surrounds the core is the shell layer. The shell layer is metal-like in that it can conduct electricity and is made of a metal or metal-like material. It is also preferred that the adjacent inner layer to the shell layer be nonconducting. Specifically contemplated are nonconducting layers made of dielectric materials and semiconductors. Suitable dielectric materials include but are not limited to silicon dioxide, titanium dioxide, polymethyl methacrylate (PMMA), polystyrene, gold sulfide and macromolecules such as dendrimers. In certain embodiments of the invention, the nonconducting layer is comprised of a semiconductor material. For example, core particles may be made of CdSe, CdS or GaAs. In spherical embodiments, the particles have a homogeneous radius that can range from approximately 1 to 10 nanometers to several microns depending upon the desired absorbance maximum of the embodiment. The conducting shell layers of the invention have thicknesses that range from approximately 1 to 100 nm.

The core-shell particles of Mulvaney et al and Oldenberg are essentially the same. Many of the components of the particles are equated, such as CDS, CDSe, (for the core) and silver and copper, (for the shell). See Mulvaney at col. 4.line 63 through col. 5, line 6 and col. 5, lines 35-40 and col. 7, lines 48-49.

In view of the teachings of Oldenburg et al, it would have been obvious to form the core-shell particles wherein the shell layer is directly deposited on the core layer since such a process is well known in the art. See col. 4, line 63 through col. 5, lines 40.

See col. 3, line 35 through col. 8, line 30 and Examples IV and V.

Response to Arguments

Application/Control Number: 10/516,930

Art Unit: 1714

4. Applicant's arguments filed 8/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that neither reference teach a coating having core-shell particles that are free of organic parts. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features

Page 6

of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the

exclusion of organic parts) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Applicant's claims recite a

core "comprising" nanoscale particles wherein the nanoscale particles are selected from the

group of listed inorganic components. However organic parts are not excluded from the core by

virtue of applicant's use of the term, "comprising". Although the claims are interpreted in light

of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van

Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

5. Mulvaney does teach a shell formed by at least one metal having antimicrobial action.

Again, Mulvaney states that the source of the coating may be a metal selected from the group

consisting of platinum, palladium, iridium, bismuth, copper, silver, gold, and alloys and

mixtures thereof.

6. Claims 17, 18, 19 and 32 are allowed.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 1714

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kriellion A. Sanders whose telephone number is 571-272-1122. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 6:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on 571-272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kriellion A. Sanders Primary Examiner Art Unit 1714